IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

CORPORATION and LAW DEBENTURE TRUST COMPANY OF NEW YORK,	
Plaintiffs,	
V.	C.A. No. 04-1494-JJF
NORTHWESTERN CORPORATION,	
Defendant.	
MAGTEN ASSET MANAGEMENT CORPORATION,	
Plaintiffs,	
v.	C.A. No. 05-0499-JJF
MIKE J. HANSON and ERNIE J. KINDT	
Defendants.	
STATE OF NEW YORK)	
) ss.: COUNTY OF NEW YORK)	

JOSEPH D. PIZZURRO, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

1. I have been admitted pro hac vice to the bar of this Court and am a member of the firm of Curtis, Mallet-Prevost, Colt & Mosle LLP, counsel for defendant NorthWestern Corporation ("NorthWestern") in the above-referenced action. I submit this affidavit in support of the Joint Motion of Defendants NorthWestern Corporation, Michael J. Hanson and Ernie J. Kindt pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c) and Local Rule 30.2 for a Protective Order.

- 2. On March 14, 2007, John Brewer, counsel to plaintiff Magten Asset Management Corporation ("Magten"), wrote to defendants' counsel stating that plaintiffs intended to take the depositions of Messrs. Hanson and Kindt as well as NorthWestern employees Thielbar and Kliewer during the weeks of April 16 and 23 and asked for convenient dates in those two weeks. A copy of that letter is attached as Exhibit A.
- 3. Subsequently I had a conversation with Bonnie Steingart, also counsel to Magten, where she suggested that those depositions, as well as the depositions of the various non-parties subpoenaed by plaintiffs, be clustered during those weeks in cities to avoid travel as much as possible. I agreed with that approach and subsequently suggested that, because plaintiffs had noticed Mr. Lewis in Minneapolis on April 17 that the defendants, as a concession to plaintiffs, would be willing to bring Messrs. Hanson, Kindt and Kliewer to Minneapolis that same week, and not insist that they be deposed in Sioux Falls, South Dakota. I proposed that we try to cluster other depositions the following week in Chicago because plaintiffs had subpoenaed Mr. Drook for April 25 in Chicago. I also suggested that many of the remaining depositions, including Talton Embry, Bank of New York and Deloitte & Touche, could be done the week of April 30 in New York.
- 4. Ms. Steingart was generally agreeable with this approach and told me that she was not sure whether she would be taking the depositions of Mr. Thielbar, Mr. Kliewer or the Bank of New York and asked if we could move those depositions to the end of the schedule.
- 5. On or about April 9, we learned from Plaintiffs that the schedule we had discussed had to be changed because John Snellings, counsel for plaintiff Law Debenture Trust Company of New York, was not available for 5 of the 10 days during the last two weeks in April which plaintiffs had originally proposed for depositions.

- 6. After learning of Mr. Snellings limited availability, I worked with counsel for Messrs. Hanson and Kindt to determine alternative dates for the depositions of NorthWestern's officers and employees. In the midst of this, plaintiffs unilaterally announced that they were withdrawing the non-party deposition scheduled for April 17 in Minneapolis. Further, plaintiffs demanded that the depositions of NorthWestern's witnesses take place in New York or Delaware and that those depositions remain open until plaintiffs' issues with NorthWestern's privilege designations are resolved.
- 7. I objected to the location of the depositions of Messrs. Hanson and Kindt in New York or Delaware. As a compromise, I offered that their depositions take place in Minneapolis. Ms. Steingart and I had a subsequent conversation during the week of April 9, 2007. We discussed the possibility of bringing Messrs. Hanson and Kindt to Chicago to be deposed after Mr. Drook's deposition, which was scheduled for that city on April 25. However, Ms. Steingart also requested that we agree that Messrs. Hanson and Kindt would have to be redeposed if the Court ruled that plaintiffs were entitled to certain documents as to which NorthWestern had asserted a privilege I stated that under no circumstances would defendants agree that Messrs. Hanson and Kindt could be deposed more than once. On April 11, 2007 I sent Ms. Steingart a letter setting forth our position on the scheduling of depositions. A copy of this letter is attached as Exhibit B.
- 8. On April 12, 2007, Plaintiff Magten served Defendants with deposition notices for Mr. Hanson and Mr. Kindt for April 23 and 24, respectively, in Wilmington, Delaware. Copies of the deposition notices are attached as Exhibit C.

-3-

- 9. I am informed that, during this same period of time, counsel for Messrs. Hanson and Kindt were having discussions with counsel for Plaintiffs regarding Mr. Hanson's availability. I am informed that prior to April 12, 2007, counsel for Mr. Hanson told counsel for Magten that Mr. Hanson could not be available to be deposed on April 23. However, Mr. Hanson was available on April 26. A copy of an email dated April 5, 2007 from Kimberly A. Beatty, counsel to Messrs. Hanson and Kindt, is attached as Exhibit D.
- 10. I had another conversation with Ms. Steingart concerning these issues on April 18, 2007. We again discussed the possibility of having Messrs. Hanson and Kindt be deposed in Chicago the week of April 23, 2007. I told her again that we could not agree unless they were deposed only once, and told her that, if we could not reach agreement we were prepared to file this Motion for a Protective Order. We could not reach an agreement, and Ms. Steingart subsequently sent me an email on this issue, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit E.
- 11. Attached hereto as Exhibit F is the Affidavit of Michael J. Hanson dated April 19, 2007.
- 12. Attached hereto as Exhibit G is the Affidavit of Ernie J. Kindt dated April 19, 2007.
- I am informed that Bart Thielbar is the former Vice President of 13. NorthWestern Communications Solutions ("NCS"), an operating division of NorthWestern, and former Senior Vice President of Information Technology and Chief Information Officer of NorthWestern Energy. He is now Director, Special Projects for NorthWestern, I am informed that Mr. Thielbar resides in Minnesota but works in Sioux Falls, South Dakota.
- I am informed that Kendall Kliewer is the Vice President, Controller of 14. NorthWestern and works and resides in Sioux Falls, South Dakota.

-4-

- 15. Attached as Exhibit H are pages 1 through 20 of the transcript of the deposition of Talton Embry dated July 27, 2004 in In re: NorthWestern Corp., 03-12872.
- 16. Attached as Exhibit I is Magten's Response to Interrogatory 22 propounded by defendants Hanson and Kindt.
- 17. Attached as Exhibit J are selected documents produced by Magten to defendants Hanson and Kindt regarding certain of Magten's purchases of QUIPS.

Joseph Pizzur

Sworn to before me this 19 day of April 2007

JACQUELINE T. DIMARCO Notary Public, State of New York No. 31-4841199 Qualified in New York County Commission Expires Oct. 31, 2009

EXHIBIT A

Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson LLP

One New York Plaza New York, New York 10004-1980 Tel: +1.212.859.8000 Fax: +1.212.859.4000 www.friedfrank.com

Direct Line: 212.859.8736

TRHIDHRANK

Fax: 212.859.4000 brewejo@ffhsj.com

March 14, 2007

Joseph D. Pizzuro Curtis, Mallet-Prevost, Colt & Mosle LLP 101 Park Avenue New York, NY 10178

Stanley T. Kaleczyc Kimberly A. Beatty. Browning, Kaleczyc, Berry & Hoven, P.C. 139 North Last Chance Gulch Helena, MT 59601

Re: Magten Litigation -- Deposition Scheduling

Dear Counsel:

We intend to begin serving deposition notices in the near term. To minimize inconvenience to all concerned, please provide us with dates during the weeks beginning April 16 and 23 that would be convenient for Mr. Hanson, Mr. Kindt, NorthWestern employee Kendall Kliewer, and NorthWestern employee Bart Thielbar to be deposed in Wilmington. We would be happy to hold the depositions in New York rather than Wilmington if you would prefer, and might be able to take Mr. Thielbar's deposition towards the end of the week of the 9th if that would be helpful.

We also intend to take the deposition of a 30(b)(6) designee of NorthWestern in the same general time period. We will provide you with a formal 30(b)(6) notice of topics, but for your planning purposes you should assume the relevant topics will generally include the subject matter of our interrogatories and requests to admit, as well as NorthWestern's response to our document requests and the factual content of the recent SEC settlement.

Very truly yours,

John W. Brewer

JWB:ner

EXHIBIT B

CURTIS, MALLET-PREVOST, COLT & MOSLE LLP

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS AT LAW 101 PARK AVENUE NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10178-0061

PARIS STAMFORD MEXICO CITY WASHINGTON, D.C.

MUSCAT

MILAN

FRANKFURT

HOUSTON.

WRITER'S DIRECT: TEL.: 212-696-6196

TELEPHONE 212-696-6000

FACSIMILE 212-697-1559

E-MAIL INFO@CM-P.COM

INTERNET WWW.CM-P.COM

April 11, 2007

Bonnie Steingart, Esq. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson LLP One New York Plaza New York, NY 10004-1980

Re:

Magten Asset Management Corp. and Law Debenture Trust Co. v. NorthWestern Corp.: C.A. No. 04-1494-JJF

Dear Bonnie:

We write as counsel to NorthWestern and on behalf of counsel for Messrs. Hanson and Kindt, in response to your email of last evening. It's unfortunate that we seem to have reached an impasse on some of the scheduling issues for the depositions. However, the problems that have arisen are entirely the fault of Plaintiffs.

John Brewer wrote to Defendants' counsel on March 14 stating that Plaintiffs intended to take the depositions of Messrs. Hanson and Kindt as well as NorthWestern employees Thielbar and Kliewer during the weeks of April 16 and 23 and asked for convenient dates in those two weeks. Subsequently you and I had a conversation where you suggested that those depositions, as well as the depositions of the various non-parties subpoenaed by Plaintiffs, be clustered during those weeks in cities to avoid travel as much as possible. I agreed with that approach and subsequently suggested that, because Plaintiffs had noticed Mr. Lewis in Minneapolis on April 17 that the defendants, as a concession to Plaintiffs, would be willing to bring Messrs. Hanson, Kindt and Kliewer to Minneapolis that same week, and not insist that they be deposed in Sioux Falls, South Dakota. I made it clear that Mr. Hanson's availability that week was limited to the 18th. I proposed that we try to cluster other depositions the following week in Chicago because you had subpoenaed Mr. Drook for April 25 in Chicago. I also suggested that many of the remaining depositions, including Talton Embry, Bank of New York and Deloitte & Touche, could be done the week of April 30 in New York. You were generally agreeable with this approach and told me that you were not sure whether you would be taking the depositions of Mr. Thielbar, Mr. Kliewer or the Bank of New York and asked if we could move those depositions to the end of the schedule. However, last week we were informed for the first time that this schedule would not work because John Snelling was not available for most of the

Page 10 of 40

CURTIS, MALLET-PREVOST, COLT & MOSLE LLP ATTORNETS AND COUNSELLORS AT LAW

Page 2

Bonnie Steingart, Esq. April 11, 2007

two weeks you originally suggested and which are the two weeks prior to the close of fact discovery. Since then the deposition scheduling process and your cooperation have gone down hill. All alternative schedules proposed by Defendants' counsel have been met with resistance from your side.

Plaintiffs may take Mr. Hanson's deposition in Sioux Falls, South Dakota, the corporate headquarters of NorthWestern, on April 18 and Mr. Kindt's there as well on April 19. As you are aware, the case law is clear that, regardless of the place of the forum, a corporate defendant is entitled to have its corporate representatives deposed at the corporate headquarters. However, we are still willing to make Mr. Hanson available in Minneapolis on April 18. As I told you earlier, as chief executive officer of NorthWestern he is quite busy these days and has no time to travel to the east coast. Mr. Kindt will also be made available in Minneapolis on April 19. Mr. Snelling's scheduling issue with this latter date should not pose a problem in as much as his client has asserted no claim against Mr. Kindt.

We do not agree that any of the depositions will remain open until the issue of privilege is resolved. The issue of whether documents which may have been produced to the SEC are still subject to a claim of privilege is one in which was raised in correspondence between you and me as early as December, and was mentioned again in front of the Special Master in January. You have had our privilege log now for over two weeks. This issue could have been raised by Plaintiffs in a motion long ago.

Counsel for Messrs. Hanson and Kindt have suggested several dates for Mr. Embry's deposition. Each time, we have all been told that he is not available on the date suggested. As you have previously been informed, Mr. Kaleczyc, lead trial counsel for Messrs. Hanson and Kindt, is not available the weeks of May 7, 14 or 21 due to other trial schedules, and therefore, Mr. Embry's deposition must take place before that time. In a last effort to be cooperative, counsel for Messrs. Hanson and Kindt were prepared to offer to depose Mr. Embry in New York City on either April 23 or April 30 at your election; however, as we were preparing this letter to you, we received John Brewer's email informing us that you have now unilaterally scheduled Mr. Fresia's deposition for April 30. Therefore, Mr. Embry's deposition will be noticed for April 23.

Finally, we must address the other eight witnesses that you have indicated you want to depose, some of whom you have previously noticed for depositions. You have informed us that Mr. Fresia, currently scheduled for May 1 in Denver, is not available that date and therefore must be rescheduled; we now understand that you have unilaterally rescheduled this deposition for April 30, which again is contrary to the notion that we would attempt to cluster depositions in various cities. We are also informed that the American Appraisal witness, to the extent you still want to depose him, is located in New Jersey, and therefore must be rescheduled. Richard Hylland's deposition is currently set for May 2 in Minneapolis, and is set simultaneously with the date for the deposition of the Bank of New York which is scheduled for New York. You have informed us that you will be canceling Mr. Lewis' deposition for April 17, but have not suggested an alternative date or location. You have also informed us that you may want to reschedule the Deloitte & Touche deposition for a later date to allow you time to review their

CURTIS, MALLET-PREVOST, COLT & MOSLE LLP

Page 3

Bonnie Steingart, Esq. April 11, 2007

documents. You have also indicated that you are not sure whether you want to depose Mr. Thielbar or a 30(b)(6) representative of NorthWestern, but that if you do, you want to move them to the end of the schedule. Provided we can work out the scheduling of the above witnesses, we would be willing to extend the close of fact discovery by one week to schedule two depositions during the week of May 6 in Minneapolis.

Yours truly,

loseph D. Pizzurro

cc: Gary L. Kaplan, Esq.
John W. Brewer, Esq.
Victoria W. Counihan, Esq.
Denise Seastone Kraft, Esq.
Dennis A. Meloro, Esq.
John V. Snellings, Esq.
Dale R. Dubé, Esq.
Stanley T. Kaleczyc, Esq.
Kimberly A. Beatty, Esq.

EXHIBIT C

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

MAGTEN ASSET MANAGEMENT CORPORATION and LAW DEBENTURE TRUST COMPANY OF NEW YORK,)))
Plaintiffs,) }
v.	C.A. No. 04-1494-(JJF)
NORTHWESTERN CORPORATION,))
Defendant.) }
MAGTEN ASSET MANAGEMENT CORP.,)
Plaintiff,))
ν,	C.A. Action No. 05-499 (JJF)
MICHAEL J. HANSON and ERNIE J. KINDT,))
Defendants.))

TO: Denise Seastone Kraft
Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge LLP
919 North Market Street
15th Floor
Wilmington, DE 19801

Stanley T. Kaleczyc Kimberly A. Beatty Browning, Kaleczyc, Berry & Hoven, P.C. 139 North Last Chance Gulch P.O. Box 1697 Helena, Mt 59624

NOTICE OF DEPOSITION

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff Magten Asset Management Corp. will take the deposition of Michael J. Hanson commencing at 9:30 a.m. on April 24, 2007 and continuing until completed, at the offices of Blank Rome LLP, 1201 Market Street, Suite 800, Wilmington, Delaware 19801. The deposition will be taken before a notary public or other officer authorized by law to administer oaths, and may be recorded by stenographic and videographic means.

April 12, 2007

BLANK ROME LLP

/s/ Dale R. Dubé

Dale R. Dubé (DE No. 2863) Bonnie G. Fatell (DE No. 3809) David W. Carickhoff (DE No. 3715) 1201 Market Street, Suite 800 Wilmington, DE 19801

Telephone: (302) 425-6400 Facsimile: (302) 425-6464

- and -

FRIED, FRANK, HARRIS, SHRIVER & JACOBSON LLP

Bonnie Steingart Gary L. Kaplan John W. Brewer One New York Plaza New York, NY 10004 Telephone: (212) 859-8000

Facsimile: (212) 859-4000

Counsel for Magten Asset Management

Corporation

Page 15 of 40

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 12th day of April, 2007, I served by hand delivery and electronic filing the NOTICE OF DEPOSITION using CM/ECF which will send notification of such filing(s) to the following:

BY EMAIL AND HAND DELIVERY

Kathleen M. Miller, Esquire Smith Katzenstein & Furlow LLP 800 Delaware Avenue P. O. Box 410 Wilmington, DE 19899

David A. Jenkins, Esquire Smith Katzenstein & Furlow LLP 800 Delaware Avenue P. O. Box 410 Wilmington, DE 19899

Victoria Watson Counihan, Esquire Dennis A. Meloro, Esquire Greenberg Traurig LLP The Nemours Building 1007 North Orange Street, Suite 1200 Wilmington, DE 19801

Denise Seastone Kraft, Esquire Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge LLP 919 North Market Street, 15th Floor Wilmington, DE 19801

I also certify that, on this 12th day of April, 2007, I served the aforementioned document, by e-mail and Federal Express, upon the following participants:

BY EMAIL AND FEDERAL EXPRESS

Stanley T. Kaleczyc, Esquire Kimberly A. Beatty, Esquire Browning, Kaleczyc, Berry & Hoven, P.C. 139 North Last Chance Gulch P.O. Box 1697 Helena, Mt 59624

Bijan Amini, Esquire Avery Samet, Esquire Bradley F. Silverman, Esquire Storch Amini & Munves PC 2 Grand Central Tower 140 East 45th Street, 25th Floor New York, New York 10017

Steven J. Reisman, Esquire Joseph D. Pizzurro, Esquire Nancy E. Delaney, Esquire Miriam K. Harwood, Esquire Curtis, Mallet-Prevost, Colt & Mosle LLP 101 Park Avenue New York, New York 10178-0061

John V. Snellings, Esquire Amanda D. Darwin, Esquire Nixon Peabody LLP 100 Summer Street Boston, Massachusetts 02110-1832

Dale R. Dulid (No. 2863)

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

MAGTEN ASSET MANAGEMENT CORPORATION and LAW DEBENTURE TRUST COMPANY OF NEW YORK,	
Plaintiffs,	
v.	C.A. No. 04-1494-(JJF)
NORTHWESTERN CORPORATION,) }
Defendant.))
MAGTEN ASSET MANAGEMENT CORP.,)
Plaintiff,	
ν.	C.A. Action No. 05-499 (JJF)
MICHAEL J. HANSON and ERNIE J. KINDT,	
Defendants.)

TO: Denise Seastone Kraft
Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge LLP
919 North Market Street
15th Floor
Wilmington, DE 19801

Stanley T. Kaleczyc Kimberly A. Beatty Browning, Kaleczyc, Berry & Hoven, P.C. 139 North Last Chance Gulch P.O. Box 1697 Helena, Mt 59624

NOTICE OF DEPOSITION

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff Magten Asset Management Corp. will take the deposition of Ernie J. Kindt commencing at 9:30 a.m. on April 23, 2007 and continuing until completed, at the offices of Blank Rome LLP, 1201 Market Street, Suite 800, Wilmington, Delaware 19801. The deposition will be taken before a notary public or other officer authorized by law to administer oaths, and may be recorded by stenographic and videographic means.

April 12, 2007

BLANK ROME LLP

/s/ Dale R. Dubé

Dale R. Dubé (DE No. 2863) Bonnie G. Fatell (DE No. 3809) David W. Carickhoff (DE No. 3715) 1201 Market Street, Suite 800 Wilmington, DE 19801

Telephone: (302) 425-6400 Facsimile: (302) 425-6464

- and -

FRIED, FRANK, HARRIS, SHRIVER & JACOBSON LLP

Bonnie Steingart Gary L. Kaplan John W. Brewer One New York Plaza New York, NY 10004 Telephone: (212) 859-8000

Facsimile: (212) 859-4000

Counsel for Magten Asset Management

Corporation

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 12th day of April, 2007, I served by hand delivery and electronic filing the NOTICE OF DEPOSITION using CM/ECF which will send notification of such filing(s) to the following:

BY EMAIL AND HAND DELIVERY

Kathleen M. Miller, Esquire Smith Katzenstein & Furlow LLP 800 Delaware Avenue P. O. Box 410 Wilmington, DE 19899

David A. Jenkins, Esquire Smith Katzenstein & Furlow LLP 800 Delaware Avenue P. O. Box 410 Wilmington, DE 19899

Victoria Watson Counihan, Esquire Dennis A. Meloro, Esquire Greenberg Traurig LLP The Nemours Building 1007 North Orange Street, Suite 1200 Wilmington, DE 19801

Denise Seastone Kraft, Esquire Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge LLP 919 North Market Street, 15th Floor Wilmington, DE 19801

I also certify that, on this 12th day of April, 2007, I served the aforementioned document, by e-mail and Federal Express, upon the following participants:

BY EMAIL AND FEDERAL EXPRESS

Stanley T. Kaleczyc, Esquire Kimberly A. Beatty, Esquire Browning, Kaleczyc, Berry & Hoven, P.C. 139 North Last Chance Gulch P.O. Box 1697 Helena, Mt 59624

Bijan Amini, Esquire Avery Samet, Esquire Bradley F. Silverman, Esquire Storch Amini & Munves PC 2 Grand Central Tower 140 East 45th Street, 25th Floor New York, New York 10017

Steven J. Reisman, Esquire Joseph D. Pizzurro, Esquire Nancy E. Delaney, Esquire Miriam K. Harwood, Esquire Curtis, Mallet-Prevost, Colt & Mosle LLP 101 Park Avenue New York, New York 10178-0061

John V. Snellings, Esquire Amanda D. Darwin, Esquire Nixon Peabody LLP 100 Summer Street Boston, Massachusetts 02110-1832

Dale R. Dubé (No. 2863)

EXHIBIT D

Pizzurro, Joseph D.

From: KIM Beatty [KIM@bkbh.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 05, 2007 6:27 PM
Delaney, Nancy E.; John W. Brewer

Cc: STAN Kaleczyc; Gary Kaplan; Bonnie Steingart; jsnellings@nixonpeabody.com

Subject: RE: Orme Deposition

Counsel:

In light of John Snelling's email of a few days ago indicating he could only attend depositions the week of April 16 "at great expense" and as supplemented by Bonnie's email indicating the names of three witnesses she might not want to depose afterall, we took the initiative to try to come up with a proposal that (1) minimizes the number of depositions to be conducted during the week of April 16 and (2) switch the order of the depositions so that the depositions that John and Bonnie indicated were "key" depositions requiring John's participation could be scheduled during the weeks John was available.

Therefore, after consulting with NorthWestern's counsel as to the available dates for their witnesses, we propose the following schedule:

Atlanta: April 12, 2007 Kip Orme

Chicago: April 18, 2007 American Appraisal (Chicago)

April 19, 2007 Drook (Chicago)

Minn/Denver: April 24, 2007 Hylland

April 25, 2007 Kindt April 26, 2007 Hanson

April 27, 2007 Friesa (Denver)

New York: May 1, 2007 Deloitte & Touche
May 2, 2007 Bank of New York

May 3, 2007 Bank of New York
May 3, 2007 Talton Embry

Minneapolis: May 8, 2007 Lewis
May 9, 2007 Thielbar

May 10, 2007 Kliewer

However, not wanting to suggest a schedule where other witnesses would not be available, we tried to contact counsel for Hylland, Drook, Thielbar, and Lewis to see if they would each be amenable to the switch in deposition dates. Thielbar's counsel agreed to a deposition during the week of May 7; Hylland's counsel is on vacation this week; Drook's counsel has not returned the message left; and Lewis' counsel responded that Lewis was not available at any time between mid-April and the end of May and therefore would only appear on the date set forth in the Subpoena sent by Magten: April 17 in Minneapolis.

Therefore, we are at a loss as to what schedule to propose that will accommodate the needs of all counsel. Mr. Hanson and Mr. Kindt are available only on the dates we have previously suggested (April 18 and 19) and the dates set forth in the above proposal (April 25 and 26). We would like to cluster depositions in appropriate cities to minimize travel which cris-crosses the country. Due to our other trial schedules in May, we cannot push depositions past May 10; and we are not agreeable to conducting multiple depositions in several different cities on the same day. Because time is now running very short and we would all like to finalize the deposition schedule, we await input and suggestions from each of you.

Sincerely,

Kimberly A. Beatty Browning, Kaleczyc, Berry & Hoven, P.C. 139 North Last Chance Gulch Helena, MT 59601

EXHIBIT E

Pizzurro, Joseph D.

From: Steingart, Bonnie [SteinBo@friedfrank.com]

Sent: Wednesday, April 18, 2007 4:56 PM

To: Pizzurro, Joseph D.

Subject: RE: Update re Friesa Deposition

I do not want to leave you with a misimpression about the depositions. While we could agree to try to put off the depositions until the court may decide on the claims of privilege, it is important to complete the deposition of Mr. Hanson as soon as possible. Mr. Hanson must be produced by Northwestern regardless of his testimony as a party to the other lawsuit. So to the extent that Mr. Hanson is not deposed on either April 26 or April 27, his deposition must be scheduled within the time remaining for fact discovery or within some modest extension thereof to accommodate his schedule. If you or his other counsel agree to a reasonable schedule, we are willing to withdraw the notices served on Messrs. Hanson and Kindt. If you are unable to suggest such a schedule, I guess you have no choice but to move for a protective order. As to the third parties, John Brewer will get back to you about that schedule tomorrow. We are trying to contact them to see if some movement of dates is possible so that we can use all available documents with them.

```
----Original Message----
From: Pizzurro, Joseph D. [mailto:jpizzurro@cm-p.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 18, 2007 3:46 PM
To: Brewer, John W.; Steingart, Bonnie; Delaney, Nancy E.; John V.
Snellings Esq. (E-mail); Kaplan, Gary; Nadritch, Jordanna
Cc: Stanley T. Kaleczyc Esq. (E-mail); Kimberly A. Beatty Esq. (E-mail);
Bagnato, Jennifer A.
Subject: RE: Update re Friesa Deposition
John,
With all the changes could you let us all know what depositions are
still scheduled to go forward and on what dates. Thanks
Joseph D.Pizzurro
Curtis, Mallet-Prevost, Colt & Mosle LLP
101 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10178
Tel: 212 696 6196
Fax: 212 697 1559
Email: jpizzurro@cm-p.com
----Original Message----
From: Brewer, John W. [mailto:BreweJo@friedfrank.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 18, 2007 3:27 PM
To: Steingart, Bonnie; Delaney, Nancy E.; John V. Snellings Esq.
(E-mail); Kaplan, Gary; Nadritch, Jordanna
Cc: Stanley T. Kaleczyc Esq. (E-mail); Kimberly A. Beatty Esq. (E-mail);
Pizzurro, Joseph D.; Bagnato, Jennifer A.
Subject: Update re Friesa Deposition
```

Dear Counsel:

You will recall that in a series of emails last week I advised you that the originally-noticed May 1 date for Rick Fresia had become problematic and then (following a series of communications with Mr. Fresia's counsel) that April 30 was a firm date for Mr. Fresia's deposition. Unfortunately, subsequent developments have made the April 30 date problematic as well. In particular, we have been advised that

EXHIBIT F

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

MAGTEN ASSET MANAGEMENT CORPORATION,	Civil Action No. 05-499-JJF
Plaintiff,	AFFIDAVIT OF MICHAEL J. HANSON
v.	
MIKE J. HANSON and ERNIE J. KINDT	
Defendants.	

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

:SS

)

County of Minnehaha)

MICHAEL J. HANSON, first being duly sworn upon his oath deposes and says:

- 1. I live in rural Sioux Falls, South Dakota.
- 2. At all times material to the Complaint in this action, I served as an officer of Clark Fork and Blackfoot, LLC, and was employed by NorthWestern Corporation, working in Sioux Falls, South Dakota.
- 3. I currently serve as the President & CEO for NorthWestern Corporation.
 NorthWestern Corporation is headquartered in Sioux Falls, South Dakota. I work in NorthWestern's Sioux Falls' headquarters.
- 4. NorthWestern Corporation utilizes approximately 1,350 employees to serve approximately 640,000 customers. NorthWestern Corporation operates in South Dakota, Nebraska, and Montana. As CEO of this large and complex publicly traded organization, I am required to spend as much time governing our operations as possible. These obligations required that I spend the majority of my time in the

Page 25 of 40

corporate headquarters in Sioux Falls, or in the Montana headquarters in Butte. Montana. Because the corporation also operates in Nebraska, I make periodic trips to Nebraska as well. In addition to my daily management responsibilities, NorthWestern Corporation is presently in the middle of an acquisition transaction. The impending sale of NorthWestern Corporation requires me to devote additional time and attention to these matters, further impairing my ability to travel away from the corporate headquarters to give a deposition.

5. Because of my schedule, I am not available to be deposed on April 24, 2007 in any location. However, a deposition in Delaware would create an intractable conflict in my schedule as the travel time would impact several other obligations.

Document 153

- 6. It would be unduly burdensome for the Plaintiff to force me to travel to Wilmington. Delaware to the deposition. Wilmington is well over a thousand miles from Sioux Falls. There are no direct airline flights from Sioux Falls to Wilmington, or any other city on the East Coast. As a result, any trip from Sioux Falls to Wilmington will be composed of long flights, multiple stops and significant layovers. Upon information and belief, the average air travel time from Sioux Falls, South Dakota to Wilmington. Delaware is 9 to 10 hours.
- 7. As a result, giving my deposition in Wilmington, Delaware will require me to travel and be away from my home and my work for a minimum of three days.
- 8. Given the demands of my daily management responsibilities at NorthWestern Corporation, my already full schedule, and the impending sale of the company, it would be extremely disruptive to have to travel from South Dakota to Delaware to attend a deposition. This hardship is only exacerbated if the Plaintiffs in this litigation are permitted to depose me on two separate occasions as they are currently demanding.

Further your affiant sayeth not.

lichael J. Hanson

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 19th day of April, 2007.

Notary Public for the State of South Dakota Printed Name:

Residing at: 125

My Commission Expires: July

EXHIBIT G

N. C. A. CHONDAY A. CHONDON A. A. A.Y. A. CHON TOP

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

CORPORATION,	EMEN I	Civil Action No. 05-499-JJF			
Plaintiff,		AFFIDAVIT OF ERNEST J. KINDT			
v.					
MIKE J. HANSON and ERN	IIE J. KINDT				
Defendants.					
STATE OF MONTANA)				
	:ss				
County of Butte, Silver Bow)				

ERNEST J. KINDT, first being duly sworn upon his oath deposes and says:

- 1. I live in Butte, Montana.
- At all times material to the Complaint in this action, I was an officer of Clark Fork 2. and Blackfoot, LLC (f/k/a Montana Power LLC and NorthWestern Energy LLC), working in and with its Montana utility business in its Butte, Montana office.
- Clark Fork and Blackfoot, LLC is a Montana limited liability company with its 3. principal place of business in Butte, Montana, and is a subsidiary of NorthWestern Corporation.

1

- NorthWestern Corporation has its principal place of business in Sioux Falls, South 4. Dakota.
- Between 1975 and 2002, I was employed by The Montana Power Company, working 5. with its Montana electric and gas utility business. When The Montana Power Company sold its utility assets to NorthWestern Corporation in February 2002, I became an employee of NorthWestern Energy LLC, and after November 15, 2002 I became an employee of NorthWestern Corporation. At all times I was employed in the Butte, Montana office.
- I retired from active employment with NorthWestern Corporation on or about June б. 30, 2003.
- I currently work on an independent contract basis for NorthWestern Corporation in 7. the corporation's Butte, Montana office.
- It is unduly burdensome for me to travel to Wilmington, Delaware to give my 8. deposition in these matters. Wilmington, Delaware is more than two thousand miles from Butte, Montana. There are no direct airline flights from Butte to Wilmington, or any airport in the vicinity of Wilmington. In fact, airline carriers servicing Butte fly directly only to Bozeman, Montana, Salt Lake City, Utah, and Seattle, Washington. As a result, any trip from Butte to Wilmington will be composed of long flights, multiple stops and numerous layovers. Upon information and belief, the average flight time from Butte, Montana to Wilmington, Delaware is approximately 12 and a half hours.
- Due to Montana's relatively remote location and the fact that limited airline carriers 9. service Montana generally, and fewer service Butte, specifically, it will take me a full day to travel to Wilmington and a full day to travel home. As a result, giving my deposition in Wilmington, Delaware will require me to travel and be away from my home and my work for a minimum of three days.

Further your affiant sayeth not.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 19th day of April, 2007.

Printed Name: TRACU

Residing at: Kuthe My Commission Expires:

EXHIBIT H

Page 4 APPEARANCES: don't care about his wealth. 2 GREENBERG TRAURIG. LLP Attorneys for Debtor MS. STEINGART: Okay. 3 Brandywine Building 1000 West Street, Suite 1540 4 A. None. Wilmington, Delaware 19801 SCOTT D. COUSINS, ESO WILLIAM E. CHIPMAN, JR., ESQ Q. What is your relationship to 5 BY Magten? 6 A. lown it. PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP 7 Attorneys for Creditors Committee What is your percentage of 8 New York, New York 10019-6064 9 ownership in Magten? 10 A. 100 percent. 10 BY- MIKHAIL RATNER, ESQ. Q. Do you have any unpaid positions 11 12 NIXON PEABODY LLP with Magten? Attorneys for the Law Depenture 12 100 Summer Street A. I call myself chairman. Boston, Massachusetts 02: (0-2131 13 14 Q. Do you have any employee or 14 BY JOHN V. SNELLINGS, ESQ. officer positions with Magten? 15 15 FRIED, FRANK, HARRIS, SHRIVER & JACOBSON, LLP A. I have a secretary. 16 Anomeys for Magten Asset Management One New York Plaza 17 MS. STEINGART: I'm sorry, do you 17 New York, New York 10004-1980 mean does he have positions or did he 13 18 BY BONNIE STEINGART, ESQ. have others in positions? 19 GARY L. KAPLAN, ESQ. JORDANA NADRITCH, ESQ. 19 MR, COUSINS: No, he --20 16 MS. STEINGART: You want to know 21 ALSO PRESENT 21 if he holds any other titles besides 22 THOMAS J KNAPP chairman in connection with Magten? 23 Daniel R. Fisher Est. 23 MR. COUSINS: Yes: 24 Law Deberstare 24 23 A. Not that I'm aware of. 25

1 (Pages 1 to 4)

		Ī	
	' Page 5	www.huissa.hussa	Page
1	T Embry	1	T. Embry
2	Q. And how many employees does	2	Q. By whom?
3	Magten have?	3	 A. Magten Asset Management.
4	A. One.	4	Q. How long have you been with
5	Q. Who is that?	5	Magten?
6	A. Jean Colditz, C-O-L-D-I-T-Z.	6	A. 1978.
7	Q. In what is Jean's position?	7	Q. And since 1978 have you always
8	A. She is a secretary.	8	owned 100 percent of the equity of Magten?
9	Q. Mr. Embry, what did you do to	9	A. No.
10	prepare for today's deposition?	10	Q. In 1978, what was the equity
ΙΪ	A. I met with my counsel beforehand.	11	ownership of Magten?
12	I went over the documents that I had submitted	12	A. I think I owned 50 percent and a
13	to you, and we talked about what questions	13	fellow, Angus Douglass owned the other 50
14	might be asked.	14	percent.
15	Q. Did you only review the documents	15	Q. When did Mr. Douglass dispose of
	that were submitted?	16	his interests in Magten?
16	A. I believe that's correct.	17	A. Sometime in the early '80s.
17		18	O. Did he transfer that interest to
18	Q. Have you ever been deposed before?	19	you?
19		1	A. Yes.
20	A. I have.	20	
21	Q. And what context, please?	21	Q. So since the early '80s, you have
22	A. Numerous times.	22	
23	Q. Can you start with the most	23	A. Yes.
24	recent?	24	Q. Now, what was your role with
25	A. I don't know what the most recent	25	respect to the Unocal case?
	Page 6	***************************************	Page 8
1	_	. 1	Page 8 T. Embry
1 2	Page 6 T. Embry was. I'm sure there have been some between	1 2	T. Embry
2	T. Embry was. I'm sure there have been some between		T. Embry A. I had proffered to buy
L	T. Embry	2	T. Embry A. I had proffered to buy subordinated debt in the new company to be
2 3 4	T. Embry was. I'm sure there have been some between 1993 and today, but I can't remember what they are.	2 3 4	T. Embry A. I had proffered to buy subordinated debt in the new company to be formed in the buyout of Unocal.
2	T. Embry was. I'm sure there have been some between 1993 and today, but I can't remember what they are. In 1993 I had a disciplinary	2 3	T. Embry A. I had proffered to buy subordinated debt in the new company to be formed in the buyout of Unocal. Q. Did you get embroiled in the
2 3 4 5	T. Embry was. I'm sure there have been some between 1993 and today, but I can't remember what they are. In 1993 I had a disciplinary action with Securities and Exchange Commission	3 4 5	T. Embry A. I had proffered to buy subordinated debt in the new company to be formed in the buyout of Unocal.
2 3 4 5 6 7	T. Embry was. I'm sure there have been some between 1993 and today, but I can't remember what they are. In 1993 I had a disciplinary action with Securities and Exchange Commission and was deposed on that.	3 4 5 6	T. Embry A. I had proffered to buy subordinated debt in the new company to be formed in the buyout of Unocal. Q. Did you get embroiled in the Chance report litigation over Unocal with
2 3 4 5 6	T. Embry was. I'm sure there have been some between 1993 and today, but I can't remember what they are. In 1993 I had a disciplinary action with Securities and Exchange Commission and was deposed on that. During that same time frame, I	2 3 4 5 6 7	T. Embry A. I had proffered to buy subordinated debt in the new company to be formed in the buyout of Unocal. Q. Did you get embroiled in the Chance report litigation over Unocal with Icahn, is that MS. STEINGART: I object to form.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	T. Embry was. I'm sure there have been some between 1993 and today, but I can't remember what they are. In 1993 I had a disciplinary action with Securities and Exchange Commission and was deposed on that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	T. Embry A. I had proffered to buy subordinated debt in the new company to be formed in the buyout of Unocal. Q. Did you get embroiled in the Chance report litigation over Unocal with Icahn, is that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	T. Embry was. I'm sure there have been some between 1993 and today, but I can't remember what they are. In 1993 I had a disciplinary action with Securities and Exchange Commission and was deposed on that. During that same time frame, I was a witness for the U.S. Attorney's Office	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	T. Embry A. I had proffered to buy subordinated debt in the new company to be formed in the buyout of Unocal. Q. Did you get embroiled in the Chance report litigation over Unocal with Icahn, is that MS. STEINGART: I object to form. Do you want to ask if he was a witness
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	T. Embry was. I'm sure there have been some between 1993 and today, but I can't remember what they are. In 1993 I had a disciplinary action with Securities and Exchange Commission and was deposed on that. During that same time frame, I was a witness for the U.S. Attorney's Office in a securities fraud. The first time that I can	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	T. Embry A. I had proffered to buy subordinated debt in the new company to be formed in the buyout of Unocal. Q. Did you get embroiled in the Chance report litigation over Unocal with Icahn, is that MS. STEINGART: I object to form. Do you want to ask if he was a witness or a party in the dispute, maybe that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	T. Embry was. I'm sure there have been some between 1993 and today, but I can't remember what they are. In 1993 I had a disciplinary action with Securities and Exchange Commission and was deposed on that. During that same time frame, I was a witness for the U.S. Attorney's Office in a securities fraud. The first time that I can remember being deposed was in the Unocal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	T. Embry A. I had proffered to buy subordinated debt in the new company to be formed in the buyout of Unocal. Q. Did you get embroiled in the Chance report litigation over Unocal with Icahn, is that MS. STEINGART: I object to form. Do you want to ask if he was a witness or a party in the dispute, maybe that will help.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	T. Embry was. I'm sure there have been some between 1993 and today, but I can't remember what they are. In 1993 I had a disciplinary action with Securities and Exchange Commission and was deposed on that. During that same time frame, I was a witness for the U.S. Attorney's Office in a securities fraud. The first time that I can	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	T. Embry A. I had proffered to buy subordinated debt in the new company to be formed in the buyout of Unocal. Q. Did you get embroiled in the Chance report litigation over Unocal with Icahn, is that MS. STEINGART: I object to form. Do you want to ask if he was a witness or a party in the dispute, maybe that will help. Q. Why were you asked to testify in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	T. Embry was. I'm sure there have been some between 1993 and today, but I can't remember what they are. In 1993 I had a disciplinary action with Securities and Exchange Commission and was deposed on that. During that same time frame, I was a witness for the U.S. Attorney's Office in a securities fraud. The first time that I can remember being deposed was in the Unocal takeover, I think, by Carl Icahn going back in the '80s.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	T. Embry A. I had proffered to buy subordinated debt in the new company to be formed in the buyout of Unocal. Q. Did you get embroiled in the Chance report litigation over Unocal with Icahn, is that MS. STEINGART: I object to form. Do you want to ask if he was a witness or a party in the dispute, maybe that will help. Q. Why were you asked to testify in connection with Unocal?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	T. Embry was. I'm sure there have been some between 1993 and today, but I can't remember what they are. In 1993 I had a disciplinary action with Securities and Exchange Commission and was deposed on that. During that same time frame, I was a witness for the U.S. Attorney's Office in a securities fraud. The first time that I can remember being deposed was in the Unocal takeover, I think, by Carl Icahn going back in the '80s. Q. To what did the disciplinary	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	T. Embry A. I had proffered to buy subordinated debt in the new company to be formed in the buyout of Unocal. Q. Did you get embroiled in the Chance report litigation over Unocal with Icahn, is that MS. STEINGART: I object to form. Do you want to ask if he was a witness or a party in the dispute, maybe that will help. Q. Why were you asked to testify in connection with Unocal? A. Because I had offered to buy some
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	T. Embry was. I'm sure there have been some between 1993 and today, but I can't remember what they are. In 1993 I had a disciplinary action with Securities and Exchange Commission and was deposed on that. During that same time frame, I was a witness for the U.S. Attorney's Office in a securities fraud. The first time that I can remember being deposed was in the Unocal takeover, I think, by Carl Icahn going back in the '80s. Q. To what did the disciplinary action by the S.E.C. relate?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	T. Embry A. I had proffered to buy subordinated debt in the new company to be formed in the buyout of Unocal. Q. Did you get embroiled in the Chance report litigation over Unocal with Icahn, is that MS. STEINGART: I object to form. Do you want to ask if he was a witness or a party in the dispute, maybe that will help. Q. Why were you asked to testify in connection with Unocal? A. Because I had offered to buy some of the subordinated securities of the new
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	T. Embry was. I'm sure there have been some between 1993 and today, but I can't remember what they are. In 1993 I had a disciplinary action with Securities and Exchange Commission and was deposed on that. During that same time frame, I was a witness for the U.S. Attorney's Office in a securities fraud. The first time that I can remember being deposed was in the Unocal takeover, I think, by Carl Icahn going back in the '80s. Q. To what did the disciplinary action by the S.E.C. relate? A. It related to my being signing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	T. Embry A. I had proffered to buy subordinated debt in the new company to be formed in the buyout of Unocal. Q. Did you get embroiled in the Chance report litigation over Unocal with Icahn, is that MS. STEINGART: I object to form. Do you want to ask if he was a witness or a party in the dispute, maybe that will help. Q. Why were you asked to testify in connection with Unocal? A. Because I had offered to buy some of the subordinated securities of the new company.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	T. Embry was. I'm sure there have been some between 1993 and today, but I can't remember what they are. In 1993 I had a disciplinary action with Securities and Exchange Commission and was deposed on that. During that same time frame, I was a witness for the U.S. Attorney's Office in a securities fraud. The first time that I can remember being deposed was in the Unocal takeover, I think, by Carl Icahn going back in the '80s. Q. To what did the disciplinary action by the S.E.C. relate?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	T. Embry A. I had proffered to buy subordinated debt in the new company to be formed in the buyout of Unocal. Q. Did you get embroiled in the Chance report litigation over Unocal with Icahn, is that MS. STEINGART: I object to form. Do you want to ask if he was a witness or a party in the dispute, maybe that will help. Q. Why were you asked to testify in connection with Unocal? A. Because I had offered to buy some of the subordinated securities of the new company. Q. And who deposed you?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	T. Embry was. I'm sure there have been some between 1993 and today, but I can't remember what they are. In 1993 I had a disciplinary action with Securities and Exchange Commission and was deposed on that. During that same time frame, I was a witness for the U.S. Attorney's Office in a securities fraud. The first time that I can remember being deposed was in the Unocal takeover, I think, by Carl Icahn going back in the '80s. Q. To what did the disciplinary action by the S.E.C. relate? A. It related to my being signing consent that I had taken an opportunity that should have been my client's, that I returned	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	T. Embry A. I had proffered to buy subordinated debt in the new company to be formed in the buyout of Unocal. Q. Did you get embroiled in the Chance report litigation over Unocal with Icahn, is that MS. STEINGART: I object to form. Do you want to ask if he was a witness or a party in the dispute, maybe that will help. Q. Why were you asked to testify in connection with Unocal? A. Because I had offered to buy some of the subordinated securities of the new company. Q. And who deposed you? A. Skadden Arps.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	T. Embry was. I'm sure there have been some between 1993 and today, but I can't remember what they are. In 1993 I had a disciplinary action with Securities and Exchange Commission and was deposed on that. During that same time frame, I was a witness for the U.S. Attorney's Office in a securities fraud. The first time that I can remember being deposed was in the Unocal takeover, I think, by Carl Icahn going back in the '80s. Q. To what did the disciplinary action by the S.E.C. relate? A. It related to my being signing consent that I had taken an opportunity that should have been my client's, that I returned money that I had made on it, plus interest,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	T. Embry A. I had proffered to buy subordinated debt in the new company to be formed in the buyout of Unocal. Q. Did you get embroiled in the Chance report litigation over Unocal with Icahn, is that MS. STEINGART: I object to form. Do you want to ask if he was a witness or a party in the dispute, maybe that will help. Q. Why were you asked to testify in connection with Unocal? A. Because I had offered to buy some of the subordinated securities of the new company. Q. And who deposed you? A. Skadden Arps. Q. Who was who was Skadden
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	T. Embry was. I'm sure there have been some between 1993 and today, but I can't remember what they are. In 1993 I had a disciplinary action with Securities and Exchange Commission and was deposed on that. During that same time frame, I was a witness for the U.S. Attorney's Office in a securities fraud. The first time that I can remember being deposed was in the Unocal takeover, I think, by Carl Icahn going back in the '80s. Q. To what did the disciplinary action by the S.E.C. relate? A. It related to my being signing consent that I had taken an opportunity that should have been my client's, that I returned money that I had made on it, plus interest, and on paper my books and records were not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	T. Embry A. I had proffered to buy subordinated debt in the new company to be formed in the buyout of Unocal. Q. Did you get embroiled in the Chance report litigation over Unocal with Icahn, is that MS. STEINGART: I object to form. Do you want to ask if he was a witness or a party in the dispute, maybe that will help. Q. Why were you asked to testify in connection with Unocal? A. Because I had offered to buy some of the subordinated securities of the new company. Q. And who deposed you? A. Skadden Arps. Q. Who was who was Skadden representing? A. Unocal.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	T. Embry was. I'm sure there have been some between 1993 and today, but I can't remember what they are. In 1993 I had a disciplinary action with Securities and Exchange Commission and was deposed on that. During that same time frame, I was a witness for the U.S. Attorney's Office in a securities fraud. The first time that I can remember being deposed was in the Unocal takeover, I think, by Carl Icahn going back in the '80s. Q. To what did the disciplinary action by the S.E.C. relate? A. It related to my being — signing consent that I had taken an opportunity that should have been my client's, that I returned money that I had made on it, plus interest, and on paper — my books and records were not perfect.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	T. Embry A. I had proffered to buy subordinated debt in the new company to be formed in the buyout of Unocal. Q. Did you get embroiled in the Chance report litigation over Unocal with Icahn, is that MS. STEINGART: I object to form. Do you want to ask if he was a witness or a party in the dispute, maybe that will help. Q. Why were you asked to testify in connection with Unocal? A. Because I had offered to buy some of the subordinated securities of the new company. Q. And who deposed you? A. Skadden Arps. Q. Who was who was Skadden representing? A. Unocal.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	T. Embry was. I'm sure there have been some between 1993 and today, but I can't remember what they are. In 1993 I had a disciplinary action with Securities and Exchange Commission and was deposed on that. During that same time frame, I was a witness for the U.S. Attorney's Office in a securities fraud. The first time that I can remember being deposed was in the Unocal takeover, I think, by Carl Icahn going back in the '80s. Q. To what did the disciplinary action by the S.E.C. relate? A. It related to my being signing consent that I had taken an opportunity that should have been my client's, that I returned money that I had made on it, plus interest, and on paper my books and records were not perfect. Q. And were you employed at the time	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	T. Embry A. I had proffered to buy subordinated debt in the new company to be formed in the buyout of Unocal. Q. Did you get embroiled in the Chance report litigation over Unocal with Icahn, is that MS. STEINGART: I object to form. Do you want to ask if he was a witness or a party in the dispute, maybe that will help. Q. Why were you asked to testify in connection with Unocal? A. Because I had offered to buy some of the subordinated securities of the new company. Q. And who deposed you? A. Skadden Arps. Q. Who was who was Skadden representing? A. Unocal. Q. Did you testify at trial? A. No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	T. Embry was. I'm sure there have been some between 1993 and today, but I can't remember what they are. In 1993 I had a disciplinary action with Securities and Exchange Commission and was deposed on that. During that same time frame, I was a witness for the U.S. Attorney's Office in a securities fraud. The first time that I can remember being deposed was in the Unocal takeover, I think, by Carl Icahn going back in the '80s. Q. To what did the disciplinary action by the S.E.C. relate? A. It related to my being — signing consent that I had taken an opportunity that should have been my client's, that I returned money that I had made on it, plus interest, and on paper — my books and records were not perfect.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	T. Embry A. I had proffered to buy subordinated debt in the new company to be formed in the buyout of Unocal. Q. Did you get embroiled in the Chance report litigation over Unocal with Icahn, is that MS. STEINGART: I object to form. Do you want to ask if he was a witness or a party in the dispute, maybe that will help. Q. Why were you asked to testify in connection with Unocal? A. Because I had offered to buy some of the subordinated securities of the new company. Q. And who deposed you? A. Skadden Arps. Q. Who was who was Skadden representing? A. Unocal. Q. Did you testify at trial? A. No.

2 (Pages 5 to 8)

Page 9 1 T. Embry 1 T. Embry	
1 4. 44	Page 11
1. 4. 4	
2 Q. Let me show you a definition of 2 they have an interest until I asce	rtain
2 20 110 110 110 110 110 110 110 110 110	
the second of th	
The state of the s	+
a that shall a man to	
9 (Document entitled "Order 9 before we get into other individu investments, I would have to cor	
10 tarmong areas a	1181111
Upon Establishment of Ethical 11 with him. Wall (Re: Docket No. 257)" marked 12 MR. COUSINS: I don't know	
12 Wall (10. Double 110. Law)	w wnai
Debtor's Exhibit 1 for 13 that means.	
identification, as of this date.) 14 Q. What type of investments d	ioes
MS. STEINGART: Do you want to 15 Magten invest in?	
direct his attention to something? 16 A. Bonds, preferreds, stocks.	
Q. Mr. Embry, if it is easier, the 17 Q. Does it have any other type	S 01
18 reporter will mark it and then both you and 18 investments other than securities?	
19 your counsel can have a copy. 19 A. It has an investment in one	
20 If you turn to about five pages 20 partnership.	
21 in, there is a page marked "Definitions" and 21 Q. What is the business of the	
22 there is a definition of affiliate. 22 partnership?	
Could you read that definition to 23 A. Owns athletic clubs.	
24 yourself and let me know if you have an 24 Q. What types of bonds does M	viagien
25 understanding as to what an affiliate is? 25 invest in?	
Page 10	Page 12
1 T Embry 1 T. Embry	
AC CTUDICADT. Programme	, I
2 (Witness and counsel confer.) 2 MS. STEINGART: I'm sorry 3 MR. COUSINS: Let the record 3 didn't hear the last word.	,
4 reflect that deponent referred 4 Q. What types of bonds does M	lagten
5 MS. STEINGART: Consulted with 5 invest in?	•
6 counsel. 6 A. Generally lower grade bonds	S.
7 MR. COUSINS: Consulted with 7 Q. Does Magten invest in any b	
8 counsel. 8 that trade at par?	
9 A. Not that I'm aware of. 9 A. We have.	
10 O. So that was a response to my 10 Q. Do you currently hold any p	ar
11 question, does Magten have any affiliates? 11 investments in bonds?	
11 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	
12 A. Yes. 12 A. Yes.	nds,
14. (3. 4 64.	oublic
13 Q. What are your day-to-day duties 13 Q. Now, your investment in both	
13 Q. What are your day-to-day duties 14 and responsibilities with respect to Magten? 14 are those acquired off of exchanges, p	
13 Q. What are your day-to-day duties 14 and responsibilities with respect to Magten? 15 A. I don't have any duties. 16 Q. Now, your investment in both 14 are those acquired off of exchanges, proceedings of the process of the proce	
13 Q. What are your day-to-day duties 14 and responsibilities with respect to Magten? 15 A. I don't have any duties. 18 Q. Now, your investment in both are those acquired off of exchanges, possible to the property of the p	
13 Q. What are your day-to-day duties 14 and responsibilities with respect to Magten? 15 A. I don't have any duties. 16 Q. Do you have any responsibilities? 17 A. I invest money. 18 Q. What type of business is Magten 19 Q. Now, your investment in both are those acquired off of exchanges, page 21 exchanges? 10 A. Is that today? 11 Q. Yes. 12 A. No.	
13 Q. What are your day-to-day duties 14 and responsibilities with respect to Magten? 15 A. I don't have any duties. 16 Q. Do you have any responsibilities? 17 A. I invest money. 18 Q. What type of business is Magten 19 in? 10 Now, your investment in both are those acquired off of exchanges, part to exchanges? 14 are those acquired off of exchanges, part to exchanges? 15 exchanges? 16 A. Is that today? 17 Q. Yes. 18 A. No. 19 in?	у
13 Q. What are your day-to-day duties 14 and responsibilities with respect to Magten? 15 A. I don't have any duties. 16 Q. Do you have any responsibilities? 17 A. I invest money. 18 Q. What type of business is Magten 19 in? 20 A. Buys and sells investments. 11 Q. Now, your investment in both are those acquired off of exchanges, page 2 exchanges? 14 are those acquired off of exchanges, page 2 exchanges? 15 A. Is that today? 17 Q. Yes. 18 A. No. 19 Q. The bonds that you currently page 2 hold, how are they acquired?	
13 Q. What are your day-to-day duties 14 and responsibilities with respect to Magten? 15 A. I don't have any duties. 16 Q. Do you have any responsibilities? 17 A. I invest money. 18 Q. What type of business is Magten 19 in? 20 A. Buys and sells investments. 21 Q. Any particular investments? 13 Q. Now, your investment in box are those acquired off of exchanges, p. 15 exchanges? 16 A. Is that today? 17 Q. Yes. 18 A. No. 19 Q. The bonds that you currently do not hold, how are they acquired? 21 A. Purchased through a broker.	
13 Q. What are your day-to-day duties 14 and responsibilities with respect to Magten? 15 A. I don't have any duties. 16 Q. Do you have any responsibilities? 17 A. I invest money. 18 Q. What type of business is Magten 19 in? 20 A. Buys and sells investments. 21 Q. Any particular investments? 22 MS. STEINGART: Excuse me. You 28 A. No. your investment in box are those acquired off of exchanges, p. 15 exchanges? 16 A. Is that today? 17 Q. Yes. 18 A. No. 19 Q. The bonds that you currently hold, how are they acquired? 21 A. Purchased through a broker. 22 Q. You mentioned preferred. V	Were
13 Q. What are your day-to-day duties 14 and responsibilities with respect to Magten? 15 A. I don't have any duties. 16 Q. Do you have any responsibilities? 17 A. I invest money. 18 Q. What type of business is Magten 19 in? 20 A. Buys and sells investments. 21 Q. Any particular investments? 22 MS. STEINGART: Excuse me. You 23 want to know what the holdings of 20 Now, your investment in bor are those acquired off of exchanges, p. 16 A. Is that today? 17 Q. Yes. 18 A. No. 19 Q. The bonds that you currently hold, how are they acquired? 21 A. Purchased through a broker. 22 Q. You mentioned preferred. We you referring to preferred stock or sor	Were
13 Q. What are your day-to-day duties 14 and responsibilities with respect to Magten? 15 A. I don't have any duties. 16 Q. Do you have any responsibilities? 17 A. I invest money. 18 Q. What type of business is Magten 19 in? 20 A. Buys and sells investments. 21 Q. Any particular investments? 22 MS. STEINGART: Excuse me. You 28 A. No. Your investment in box are those acquired off of exchanges, p. 15 exchanges? 16 A. Is that today? 17 Q. Yes. 18 A. No. 19 Q. The bonds that you currently hold, how are they acquired? 21 A. Purchased through a broker. 22 Q. You mentioned preferred. Vo.	Were

3 (Pages 9 to 12)

	Page 13		Page 15
1	T. Embry	1	T. Embry
2	O. Preferred stock that Magten	2	that and I'm not sure that we are or not.
3	currently holds, how was that acquired?	3	O. Why does Magten invest in lower
4	A. Through open market purchases.	4	grade investments?
5	Q. And does Magten hold any stock	5	A. In the hopes of making a profit.
	other than preferred?	6	Q. And is Magten profitable?
6	A. Yes.	7	A. No.
7		8	Q. When was the last time Magten was
8	Q. And how does Magten acquire stock	1	profitable?
9	other than preferred?	9	A. It was profitable last year, but
10	A. Open market purchases.	10	
11	Q. Other than Magten's interest in	11	not the year before.
12	the partnership you referred to, does Magten	12	Q. And for the first six months of
13	hold any other investments other than bonds,	13	2004, has Magten been profitable?
14	preferred stock, stock?	14	A. No.
15	A. Not that I'm aware of.	15	Q. Do you understand the risks
16	Q. When did Magten start investing	16	associated with trading in lower grade
17	in the lower grade securities?	17	investments?
18	A. 1978.	18	MS. STEINGART: Object to the
19	Q. Would you say that Magten is	19	form.
20	experienced in investing in lower grade	20	Q. You can answer.
21	securities?	21	A. Not always.
22	A. I would say that we have done it.	22	Q. You have been in business since
23	Q. Well, you have done it since	23	1978 and you don't understand risks associated
24	1978, right?	24	with trading in lower grade investments?
25	A. Right.	25	MS. STEINGART: Object to the
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	f	
		 	
	Page 14		. Page 16
1	·		Page 16
1 2	T. Embry	1 2	
2	T. Embry Q. And you are doing it today,	3	T. Embry form. Q. You can answer.
2	T. Embry Q. And you are doing it today, right?	2	T. Embry form.
2 3 4	T. Embry Q. And you are doing it today, right? A. Right.	2	T. Embry form. Q. You can answer.
2 3 4 5	T. Embry Q. And you are doing it today, right? A. Right. Q. You wouldn't say that you are	2 3 4	T. Embry form. Q. You can answer. A. Repeat the question.
2 3 4 5 6	T. Embry Q. And you are doing it today, right? A. Right. Q. You wouldn't say that you are experienced in lower grade investments?	2 3 4 5	T. Embry form. Q. You can answer. A. Repeat the question. MR. COUSINS: Could you read that
2 3 4 5 6 7	T. Embry Q. And you are doing it today, right? A. Right. Q. You wouldn't say that you are experienced in lower grade investments? A. I may be in the business, but	2 3 4 5 6	T. Embry form. Q. You can answer. A. Repeat the question. MR. COUSINS: Could you read that back, please.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	T. Embry Q. And you are doing it today, right? A. Right. Q. You wouldn't say that you are experienced in lower grade investments? A. I may be in the business, but naive.	2 3 4 5 6 7	T. Embry form. Q. You can answer. A. Repeat the question. MR. COUSINS: Could you read that back, please. (Record read.) A. Not all of them. Q. Who made the decision for Magten
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	T. Embry Q. And you are doing it today, right? A. Right. Q. You wouldn't say that you are experienced in lower grade investments? A. I may be in the business, but naive. Q. So would you consider yourself a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	T. Embry form. Q. You can answer. A. Repeat the question. MR. COUSINS: Could you read that back, please. (Record read.) A. Not all of them.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	T. Embry Q. And you are doing it today, right? A. Right. Q. You wouldn't say that you are experienced in lower grade investments? A. I may be in the business, but naive. Q. So would you consider yourself a naive investor?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	T. Embry form. Q. You can answer. A. Repeat the question. MR. COUSINS: Could you read that back, please. (Record read.) A. Not all of them. Q. Who made the decision for Magten
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	T. Embry Q. And you are doing it today, right? A. Right. Q. You wouldn't say that you are experienced in lower grade investments? A. I may be in the business, but naive. Q. So would you consider yourself a naive investor? A. I don't know. Experience is not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	T. Embry form. Q. You can answer. A. Repeat the question. MR. COUSINS: Could you read that back, please. (Record read.) A. Not all of them. Q. Who made the decision for Magten to acquire the NorthWestern QUIPS?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	T. Embry Q. And you are doing it today, right? A. Right. Q. You wouldn't say that you are experienced in lower grade investments? A. I may be in the business, but naive. Q. So would you consider yourself a naive investor? A. I don't know. Experience is not a word that I know the exact definition.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	T. Embry form. Q. You can answer. A. Repeat the question. MR. COUSINS: Could you read that back, please. (Record read.) A. Not all of them. Q. Who made the decision for Magten to acquire the NorthWestern QUIPS? Do you know what I mean by the QUIPS? A. Yes, I do.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	T. Embry Q. And you are doing it today, right? A. Right. Q. You wouldn't say that you are experienced in lower grade investments? A. I may be in the business, but naive. Q. So would you consider yourself a naive investor? A. I don't know. Experience is not a word that I know the exact definition. Q. How would you characterize the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	T. Embry form. Q. You can answer. A. Repeat the question. MR. COUSINS: Could you read that back, please. (Record read.) A. Not all of them. Q. Who made the decision for Magten to acquire the NorthWestern QUIPS? Do you know what I mean by the QUIPS?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	T. Embry Q. And you are doing it today, right? A. Right. Q. You wouldn't say that you are experienced in lower grade investments? A. I may be in the business, but naive. Q. So would you consider yourself a naive investor? A. I don't know. Experience is not a word that I know the exact definition. Q. How would you characterize the acumen of Magten with respect to investments?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	T. Embry form. Q. You can answer. A. Repeat the question. MR. COUSINS: Could you read that back, please. (Record read.) A. Not all of them. Q. Who made the decision for Magten to acquire the NorthWestern QUIPS? Do you know what I mean by the QUIPS? A. Yes, I do.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	T. Embry Q. And you are doing it today, right? A. Right. Q. You wouldn't say that you are experienced in lower grade investments? A. I may be in the business, but naive. Q. So would you consider yourself a naive investor? A. I don't know. Experience is not a word that I know the exact definition. Q. How would you characterize the acumen of Magten with respect to investments? A. What do you mean?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	T. Embry form. Q. You can answer. A. Repeat the question. MR. COUSINS: Could you read that back, please. (Record read.) A. Not all of them. Q. Who made the decision for Magten to acquire the NorthWestern QUIPS? Do you know what I mean by the QUIPS? A. Yes, I do. Q. Who made that decision?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	T. Embry Q. And you are doing it today, right? A. Right. Q. You wouldn't say that you are experienced in lower grade investments? A. I may be in the business, but naive. Q. So would you consider yourself a naive investor? A. I don't know. Experience is not a word that I know the exact definition. Q. How would you characterize the acumen of Magten with respect to investments? A. What do you mean? Q. Would you consider yourself a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	T. Embry form. Q. You can answer. A. Repeat the question. MR. COUSINS: Could you read that back, please. (Record read.) A. Not all of them. Q. Who made the decision for Magten to acquire the NorthWestern QUIPS? Do you know what I mean by the QUIPS? A. Yes, I do. Q. Who made that decision? A. I did.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	T. Embry Q. And you are doing it today, right? A. Right. Q. You wouldn't say that you are experienced in lower grade investments? A. I may be in the business, but naive. Q. So would you consider yourself a naive investor? A. I don't know. Experience is not a word that I know the exact definition. Q. How would you characterize the acumen of Magten with respect to investments? A. What do you mean? Q. Would you consider yourself a novice?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	T. Embry form. Q. You can answer. A. Repeat the question. MR. COUSINS: Could you read that back, please. (Record read.) A. Not all of them. Q. Who made the decision for Magten to acquire the NorthWestern QUIPS? Do you know what I mean by the QUIPS? A. Yes, I do. Q. Who made that decision? A. I did. Q. What was that decision based
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	T. Embry Q. And you are doing it today, right? A. Right. Q. You wouldn't say that you are experienced in lower grade investments? A. I may be in the business, but naive. Q. So would you consider yourself a naive investor? A. I don't know. Experience is not a word that I know the exact definition. Q. How would you characterize the acumen of Magten with respect to investments? A. What do you mean? Q. Would you consider yourself a novice? A. No.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	T. Embry form. Q. You can answer. A. Repeat the question. MR. COUSINS: Could you read that back, please. (Record read.) A. Not all of them. Q. Who made the decision for Magten to acquire the NorthWestern QUIPS? Do you know what I mean by the QUIPS? A. Yes, I do. Q. Who made that decision? A. I did. Q. What was that decision based upon?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	T. Embry Q. And you are doing it today, right? A. Right. Q. You wouldn't say that you are experienced in lower grade investments? A. I may be in the business, but naive. Q. So would you consider yourself a naive investor? A. I don't know. Experience is not a word that I know the exact definition. Q. How would you characterize the acumen of Magten with respect to investments? A. What do you mean? Q. Would you consider yourself a novice? A. No. Q. Would you consider yourself a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	T. Embry form. Q. You can answer. A. Repeat the question. MR. COUSINS: Could you read that back, please. (Record read.) A. Not all of them. Q. Who made the decision for Magten to acquire the NorthWestern QUIPS? Do you know what I mean by the QUIPS? A. Yes, I do. Q. Who made that decision? A. I did. Q. What was that decision based upon? A. Based upon my review of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	T. Embry Q. And you are doing it today, right? A. Right. Q. You wouldn't say that you are experienced in lower grade investments? A. I may be in the business, but naive. Q. So would you consider yourself a naive investor? A. I don't know. Experience is not a word that I know the exact definition. Q. How would you characterize the acumen of Magten with respect to investments? A. What do you mean? Q. Would you consider yourself a novice? A. No. Q. Would you consider yourself a veteran?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	T. Embry form. Q. You can answer. A. Repeat the question. MR. COUSINS: Could you read that back, please. (Record read.) A. Not all of them. Q. Who made the decision for Magten to acquire the NorthWestern QUIPS? Do you know what I mean by the QUIPS? A. Yes, I do. Q. Who made that decision? A. I did. Q. What was that decision based upon? A. Based upon my review of the company. Q. And what did you do to review the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	T. Embry Q. And you are doing it today, right? A. Right. Q. You wouldn't say that you are experienced in lower grade investments? A. I may be in the business, but naive. Q. So would you consider yourself a naive investor? A. I don't know. Experience is not a word that I know the exact definition. Q. How would you characterize the acumen of Magten with respect to investments? A. What do you mean? Q. Would you consider yourself a novice? A. No. Q. Would you consider yourself a veteran? A. I I have been at it a long	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	T. Embry form. Q. You can answer. A. Repeat the question. MR. COUSINS: Could you read that back, please. (Record read.) A. Not all of them. Q. Who made the decision for Magten to acquire the NorthWestern QUIPS? Do you know what I mean by the QUIPS? A. Yes, I do. Q. Who made that decision? A. I did. Q. What was that decision based upon? A. Based upon my review of the company.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	T. Embry Q. And you are doing it today, right? A. Right. Q. You wouldn't say that you are experienced in lower grade investments? A. I may be in the business, but naive. Q. So would you consider yourself a naive investor? A. I don't know. Experience is not a word that I know the exact definition. Q. How would you characterize the acumen of Magten with respect to investments? A. What do you mean? Q. Would you consider yourself a novice? A. No. Q. Would you consider yourself a veteran? A. I I have been at it a long time, yes. Veteran is a good word.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	T. Embry form. Q. You can answer. A. Repeat the question. MR. COUSINS: Could you read that back, please. (Record read.) A. Not all of them. Q. Who made the decision for Magten to acquire the NorthWestern QUIPS? Do you know what I mean by the QUIPS? A. Yes, I do. Q. Who made that decision? A. I did. Q. What was that decision based upon? A. Based upon my review of the company. Q. And what did you do to review the company? A. I read the 10-Q's and 10-K,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	T. Embry Q. And you are doing it today, right? A. Right. Q. You wouldn't say that you are experienced in lower grade investments? A. I may be in the business, but naive. Q. So would you consider yourself a naive investor? A. I don't know. Experience is not a word that I know the exact definition. Q. How would you characterize the acumen of Magten with respect to investments? A. What do you mean? Q. Would you consider yourself a novice? A. No. Q. Would you consider yourself a veteran? A. I I have been at it a long time, yes. Veteran is a good word. Q. Would you consider Magten a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	T. Embry form. Q. You can answer. A. Repeat the question. MR. COUSINS: Could you read that back, please. (Record read.) A. Not all of them. Q. Who made the decision for Magten to acquire the NorthWestern QUIPS? Do you know what I mean by the QUIPS? A. Yes, I do. Q. Who made that decision? A. I did. Q. What was that decision based upon? A. Based upon my review of the company. Q. And what did you do to review the company? A. I read the 10-Q's and 10-K. 10-K's, 2001, 2002, and I guess the first
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	T. Embry Q. And you are doing it today, right? A. Right. Q. You wouldn't say that you are experienced in lower grade investments? A. I may be in the business, but naive. Q. So would you consider yourself a naive investor? A. I don't know. Experience is not a word that I know the exact definition. Q. How would you characterize the acumen of Magten with respect to investments? A. What do you mean? Q. Would you consider yourself a novice? A. No. Q. Would you consider yourself a veteran? A. I I have been at it a long time, yes. Veteran is a good word.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	T. Embry form. Q. You can answer. A. Repeat the question. MR. COUSINS: Could you read that back, please. (Record read.) A. Not all of them. Q. Who made the decision for Magten to acquire the NorthWestern QUIPS? Do you know what I mean by the QUIPS? A. Yes, I do. Q. Who made that decision? A. I did. Q. What was that decision based upon? A. Based upon my review of the company. Q. And what did you do to review the company? A. I read the 10-Q's and 10-K,

	Page 17		Page 19
1	T. Embry	1	T. Embry
	-K?	2	A. No.
3	A. April 1st which year?	3	Q. Is that, you never use outside
4	Q. 2002.	4	professionals?
5	A. I believe so.	5	A. I have on other times.
6	Q. Did you review the April 16, 2003	6	Q. In connection with the QUIPS, did
	-K?	7	you use outside professionals?
8	A. I can't certify the date, but I	8	A. I hired Fried, Frank, Harris
9 rev	viewed the 2002 10-K.	9	Shriver & Jacobson.
10	Q. Well, when you say the 2002 10-K,	10	Q. You hired them prior to your
	you talking about the 10-K that came out	11	acquisition of the QUIPS?
	2002?	12	A. After my acquisition of the
13	A. No, 10-K for fiscal year,	13	QUIPS.
	lendar year 2002.	[4	Q. So in connection with your
15	Q. So you read a 10-K in 2003 that	15	investment in the QUIPS, you were the only
	tated to fiscal year 2002?	16	Magten officer that reviewed the documentation
17	A. Yes, sir.	17	prior to investing in the QUIPS?
18	O. Let's talk about due diligence	18	MS. STEINGART: I object to the
19 th:	at Magten typically performs before making	19	form.
	investment.	20	A. Yes.
20 21	Do you normally look at S.E.C.	21	 Q. Have you ever hired an investment
	ings?	22	banker in connection with a potential
23	A. I do.	23	acquisition?
24	O. Do you review any other public	24	MS. STEINGART: A potential
	ings?	25	acquisition?
	Page 13		Page 20
,	T. Embry	1	T. Embry
1 2	A. What I'm aware of.	2	MR. COUSINS: Yes. Of
3	Q. Do you typically review an	3	securities.
	denture for indebtedness?	4	A. No.
5	A. I do.	5	Q. Accountants. The same question.
6	Q. And for preferred stock, do you	6	A. No.
	pically review the stock certificates with a	7	Q. When did Magten first acquire an
	signation of rights?	8	interest in any of the NorthWestern
9	MS. STEINGART: Designation of?	9	securities?
10	MR. COUSINS: Rights.	10	A. The end of April 2003.
11	A. It depends upon the situation.	H	Q. And what did Magten acquire?
12	Q. What is that dependent upon?	12	A. It acquired shares of preferred
13	A. It is dependent upon generally	13	stock of Montana Power.
= > 	hether a company is in arrears or not.	14	Q. How many shares?
		15	A. Approximately a million.
	Q: And if a company is in arrears,		O And you acquired those charge
14 w 15	hat do you do?	16	Q. And you acquired those shares
14 w 15 16 w 17	hat do you do? A. I look to see what the	17	over the open market?
14 w 15 16 w 17	hat do you do?	17	over the open market? A. I did.
14 w 15 16 w 17 18 cc	hat do you do? A. I look to see what the onsequences of the arrearage is. Q. If there is an arrearage, would	17 18 19	over the open market? A. I did. Q. Subsequent to the acquisition of
14 w 15 16 w 17 18 cc 19 20 yc	hat do you do? A. I look to see what the onsequences of the arrearage is. Q. If there is an arrearage, would ou then look at the stock certificate or	17 18 19 20	over the open market? A. I did. Q. Subsequent to the acquisition of the preferred shares, has Magten bought
14 w 15 16 w 17 18 cc 19 20 yc 21 de	hat do you do? A. I look to see what the onsequences of the arrearage is. Q. If there is an arrearage, would	17 18 19 20 21	over the open market? A. I did. Q. Subsequent to the acquisition of the preferred shares, has Magten bought additional preferred shares?
14 w 15 16 w 17 18 cc 19 20 yc 21 dc 22	hat do you do? A. I look to see what the onsequences of the arrearage is. Q. If there is an arrearage, would out then look at the stock certificate or esignation of rights? A. Generally, yes.	17 18 19 20 21 22	over the open market? A. I did. Q. Subsequent to the acquisition of the preferred shares, has Magten bought additional preferred shares? A. I don't I don't understand the
14 w 15 16 w 17 18 cc 19 20 yc 21 dc 22 23	hat do you do? A. I look to see what the onsequences of the arrearage is. Q. If there is an arrearage, would ou then look at the stock certificate or esignation of rights? A. Generally, yes. Q. Does Magten use outside	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	over the open market? A. I did. Q. Subsequent to the acquisition of the preferred shares, has Magten bought additional preferred shares? A. I don't I don't understand the question.
14 w 15 16 w 17 18 cc 19 20 yc 21 de 22 23 24 pr	hat do you do? A. I look to see what the onsequences of the arrearage is. Q. If there is an arrearage, would out then look at the stock certificate or esignation of rights? A. Generally, yes.	17 18 19 20 21 22	over the open market? A. I did. Q. Subsequent to the acquisition of the preferred shares, has Magten bought additional preferred shares? A. I don't I don't understand the

EXHIBIT I

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

and LAW DEBENTURE TRUST COMPANY OF NEW YORK,)))
Plaintiffs, v.)))
NORTHWESTERN CORPORATION,) Civil Action No. 04-1494 (JJF))
Defendant.)))
MAGTEN ASSET MANAGEMENT CORP., Plaintiff,)))
v. MICHAEL J. HANSON and ERNIE J. KINDT,) Civil Action No. 05-499 (JJF))
Defendants.)))

MAGTEN ASSET MANAGEMENT CORPORATION'S RESPONSE TO MICHAEL J. HANSON AND ERNIE J. KINDT'S FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES

Pursuant to Rules 26 and 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure ("FRCP"), Magten Asset Management Corporation ("Magten") hereby objects and responds to Defendants Michael J. Hanson ("Hanson") and Ernie J. Kindt's ("Kindt") First Set of Interrogatories to Magten, dated February 28, 2007, served in the above captioned action (the "Interrogatories"), as follows. Magten reserves (i) the right to object on any grounds (including but not limited to competence, relevance, materiality, privilege, confidentiality, authenticity or admissibility) to the use of these answers in any proceeding or in the trial of this or any other matter, (ii) the right to object to any other discovery concerning the subject matter of the Interrogatories, and (iii) the right but not the obligation (except as required by law or rule) to correct, revise, clarify, supplement or amend these answers and objections.

NorthWestern's confirmed chapter 11 Plan are a matter of public record and speak for themselves. The current market value of the shares being maintained in reserve for Disputed Claims varies depending on current market conditions.

INTERROGATORY NO. 22

Please state the amount of damages which you are seeking from Michael Hanson and describe with specificity how you arrived at that amount.

RESPONSE AND OBJECTIONS TO INTERROGATORY NO. 22

At present, Magten owns 1,098,431 QUIPS, each of which has a face value of \$25.

Assuming currently accrued and unpaid dividends (through and including March 31, 2007) compounded into the principal, NorthWestern owes \$34.93 on account of each QUIP.

Therefore, the total amount of compensatory damages owed with respect to Magten's current holdings as of March 31, 2007 is \$38,368,194.83, plus applicable pre-judgment interest on each missed dividend from the date it should have been paid and applicable pre-judgment interest on the principal from September 14, 2003. In addition, Magten is owed consequential and incidental damages, including but not limited to fees and expenses, in an amount it has not yet calculated. Magten is also owed punitive damages in an amount to be determined by the jury. In addition, there are other Non-Accepting QUIPS Holders that are entitled to damages calculated on the same basis, plus applicable pre-judgment interest and fees and expenses. Because Magten is asserting the rights of Montana Power Capital I, it seeks to recover damages on behalf of other Non-Accepting QUIPS Holders.

INTERROGATORY NO. 23

Please state the amount of damages which you are seeking from Ernie Kindt and describe with specificity how you arrived at that amount.

EXHIBIT J

1/0		141	
1 April 1	TRANSACT#	#5633#1	T. T.
TE: Chanki	NET 1	95,082.34	" Cled
KR. NAN	СОММ	942.00	Jaen S Greatdoun e
RPORATION BKR	PRINCIPAL INTEREST SEC FEE COMM		A Present
OS OS	INTERES		
T MANAGE	PRINCIPAL	HEVH 1 Hb	
BROKER: SET MANAGEMENT CORPORATION SETTLE, DATE: 7/4/0.5 BROKER: Security B	AMOUNT	002 7W	1
1/63 2/700 6 g	ELEANOR EMB KAMM EMBTRDOR BEDACTED MAGPART	MTE IRA MTE IRA OLIVER SEBONAC TRE IRA TRE PER	ATURE:
BUY (SELL TRADE DATE: 22/63 TOTAL POSITION: 23 72 0 SECURITY NAME: PRICE: 5.5962	SECACTED Eleanor Embry Embry & Kamm EmbryTrDorls Magten Partners Median Comment		AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE:
-		-	

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

MAGTEN ASSET MANAGEMENT CORPORATION 101: KLED JERG	SETTLE, DATE: 14/03	BROKER: TRALL TICKER: M. DAME: 1.0 4 L.	AMOUNT PRINCIPAL INTEREST SEC. FEE COMM NET TRANSACL.#	# 3 20 6708000 # 56.3917 5 00 7 800.00 - 1,800.00 # 18	(1560000 # 563920 (1000 # 140.00 # 563920 (1500 0 # 563920	145,080.00 145,080.00
(EUY) SELL	TRADE DATE: 12/23 TOTAL POSITION: 9300	PRICE: AS GO MA		REDACTED	~	TOTALS